



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1.0
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,242	11/09/2001	Victoria E. Milton	MS1-2526US	6648
22801	7590	06/26/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2173	

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/037,242	MILTON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dennis G. Bonshock	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Non-Final Rejection

Response to Amendment

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment as received on 4-17-2006.
2. Claims 1-48 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

3. Claims 1-11, 15-29, 33-43, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Understanding Universal Plug and Play, hereinafter MS, Newlin et al., patent #6,636,211, hereinafter Newlin, and Ellis et al., patent #6,771,317, hereinafter Ellis.
4. Claims 12-14, 30-32, and 44-46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MS, Newlin, Ellis, and Dubal et al., Patent #6,711,630, hereinafter Dubal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Neither the passage pointed to by the applicant or any other portion of the specification provided adequate support for how exactly the keyword is "created" by a user.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11, 15-29, 33-43, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Understanding Universal Plug and Play, hereinafter MS, Newlin et al., patent #6,636,211, hereinafter Newlin, and Ellis et al., patent #6,771,317, hereinafter Ellis.

3. With regard to claim 1, MS teaches, on page 1, paragraphs 1-4 and page 11, paragraph 4, the use of Universal Plug and play for providing a user with a set of device descriptions and list of associated device services, which allow for selective retrieval of service descriptions, and allow for invoking the actions. MS teaches, on pages 28 and page 30, that the vendor only presents categories available, and where the user selects which category to be implemented, such as the clock set application that the user selects to implement, thereby transmitting only this category of information from the control point. MS further teaches, on page 16, paragraph 4, the use of the XML Schema as defined by W3C. MS, however, doesn't teach blocking categories of information from presentation. Newlin teaches, in column 3, lines 47-65, multimedia

devices connecting with a network via a Plug-and-Play interface, similar to that of MS, but further teaches in column 8, lines 2-14, a Parental Control limiting channel selection (blocking channels) for display on a television. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS and Newlin before him at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Newlin to use Plug-and-Play as further defined by MS. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the Plug-and-Play and Universal-Plug-and-Play provide for easy set up and configuration of devices. MS and Newlin, however, don't teach blocking of categories of information where the categories are associated with at least one user-defined keyword created and entered by a user. Ellis teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, and further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 54 and column 22, line 66 through column 23, line 8, blocking categories of information from display such as: items in a "Parental Guidance" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situations, and Parental Discretion; items in a "Rating" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.; and items in a "Program" category where a user can specify specific programs to be blocked. The "Parental Guidance" category, "MPAA Rating" category, and "Program" category each have associated user-defined keywords associated with them further defining a category. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, and Ellis before him at the time the invention was made to modify the Plug-and-Play TV system of MS

and Newlin to further include the blocking of categories of information as did Ellis. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for remote blocking of categories either from a parental guidance standpoint or for the cable company to block channels that aren't be paid for by a customer.

4. With regard to claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 34, and 40, which teach the information presentation appliance conforming to Universal Plug and Play device architecture, MS, further teaches, on page 1, paragraphs 1-4, the use of the Universal Plug and Play architecture.

5. With regard to claims 3, 9, 20, 28, 36, and 42, which teach the markup language being text based, MS, further teaches, on page 11, paragraph 2, the use of XML which is known in the art to be a text based markup language (see attached definition).

6. With regard to claim 4, 21, and 37, which teaches the markup language identifies an element with a tag, and wherein the tag is defined in a schema, MS, further teaches, on page 11, paragraph 2, the use of XML which is known in the art to allow for custom tags to offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information (see attached definition).

7. With regard to claims 5, and 10, which teach information presented by the information presentation appliance is and audio information, MS further teaches, on page 1, paragraph 5, the use of UPnP for audio/video entertainment. Newlin further teaches, in column 9, lines 38-41 and in column 8, lines 55-65, the multimedia information, that is capable of being blocked, being at least one of audio signals, image signals, or data signals.

8. With regard to claims 6, and 11, which teach the information presented by the information presentation appliance is video information, MS further teaches, on page 1, paragraph 5, the use of UPnP for audio/video entertainment. Newlin further teaches, in column 9, lines 38-41 and in column 8, lines 55-65, the multimedia information, that is capable of being blocked, being at least one of audio signals, image signals, or data signals.

9. With regard to claim 7, MS teaches, on page 1, paragraphs 1-4 and page 11, paragraph 4, the use of Universal Plug and Play for providing a user with a set of device descriptions, each conveying its capabilities, and list of associated device services, which allow for selective retrieval of service descriptions, and allow for invoking the actions. MS teaches, on pages 28 and page 30, that the vendor only presents categories available, and where the user selects which category to be implemented, such as the clock set application that the user selects to implement, thereby transmitting only this category of information from the control point. MS further teaches, on page 16, paragraph 4, the use of the XML Schema as defined by W3C. MS, however, doesn't teach blocking categories of information from presentation. Newlin teaches, in column 3, lines 47-65, multimedia devices connecting with a network via a Plug-and-Play interface, similar to that of MS, but further teaches in column 8, lines 2-14, a Parental Control limiting channel selection (blocking channels) for display on a television. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS and Newlin before him at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Newlin to use Plug-and-Play as further defined by MS. One would have been motivated

to make such a combination because the Plug-and-Play and Universal-Plug-and-Play provide for easy set up and configuration of devices. MS and Newlin, however, don't teach blocking of categories of information where the categories are associated with at least one user-defined keyword input by a user. Ellis teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, and further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 54 and column 22, line 66 through column 23, line 8, blocking categories of information from display such as: items in a "Parental Guidance" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situations, and Parental Discretion; items in a "Rating" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.; and items in a "Program" category where a user can specify specific programs to be blocked. The "Parental Guidance" category, "MPAA Rating" category, and "Program" category each have associated user-defined keywords associated with them further defining a category. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, and Ellis before him at the time the invention was made to modify the Plug-and-Play TV system of MS and Newlin to further include the blocking of categories of information as did Ellis. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for remote blocking of categories either from a parental guidance standpoint or for the cable company to block channels that aren't be paid for by a customer.

10. With regard to claim 15, MS teaches, on page 1, paragraphs 1-4 and page 11, paragraph 4, the use of Universal Plug and play for providing a user with a set of device descriptions and list of associated device services, which allow for selective retrieval of service descriptions, and allow for invoking the actions. MS further teaches on page 20, paragraph 2, the user being able to control, implying some sort of input device. MS teaches, on pages 28 and page 30, that the vendor only presents categories available, and where the user selects which category to be implemented, such as the clock set application that the user selects to implement, thereby transmitting only this category of information from the control point. MS further teaches, on page 16, paragraph 4, the use of the XML Schema as defined by W3C. MS, however, doesn't teach blocking categories of information from presentation. Newlin teaches, in column 3, lines 47-65, multimedia devices connecting with a network via a Plug-and-Play interface, similar to that of MS, but further teaches in column 8, lines 2-14, a Parental Control limiting channel selection (blocking channels) for display on a television. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS and Newlin before him at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Newlin to use Plug-and-Play as further defined by MS. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the Plug-and-Play and Universal-Plug-and-Play provide for easy set up and configuration of devices. MS and Newlin, however, don't teach blocking of categories of information where the categories are associated with at least one user-defined keyword keyed in by the user. Ellis teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, and

further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 54 and column 22, line 66 through column 23, line 8, blocking categories of information from display such as: items in a “Parental Guidance” category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situations, and Parental Discretion; items in a “Rating” category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.; and items in a “Program” category where a user can specify specific programs to be blocked. The “Parental Guidance” category, “MPAA Rating” category, and “Program” category each have associated user-defined keywords associated with them further defining a category. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, and Ellis before him at the time the invention was made to modify the Plug-and-Play TV system of MS and Newlin to further include the blocking of categories of information as did Ellis. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for remote blocking of categories either from a parental guidance standpoint or for the cable company to block channels that aren’t be paid for by a customer.

11. With regard to claims 17, 25, 35, and 41, which teach the information presentation appliance is an electronic picture frame, MS further teaches, on page 1, paragraph 4, the user of UPnP in electronic imaging.
12. With regard to claims, 18 and 26, which teach the information presentation appliance being a speaker, MS further teaches, on page 1, paragraph 5, the use of UPnP for audio/video entertainment.

13. With regard to claims 19 and 27, which teach the information presentation appliance is a decoder device, MS further teaches, on page 1, paragraph 4, the use of UPnP in intelligent appliances, and PCs of all form factors.
14. With regard to claims 22 and 38, which teach the categories of information in the device description page are identified with extended tags, and wherein the extended tags are defined in an extended schema, MS, further teaches, on page 11, paragraph 2, the use of XML which is known in the art to allow for custom tags to offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information (see attached definition).
15. With regard to claim 23, MS teaches, on page 1, paragraphs 1-4 and page 11, paragraph 4, the use of Universal Plug and Play for providing a user with a set of device descriptions, each conveying its capabilities, and list of associated device services, which allow for selective retrieval of service descriptions, and allow for invoking the actions. MS further teaches on page 20, paragraph 2, the user being able to control, implying some sort of input device. MS teaches, on pages 28 and page 30, that the vendor only presents categories available, and where the user selects which category to be implemented, such as the clock set application that the user selects to implement, thereby transmitting only this category of information from the control point. MS further teaches, on page 16, paragraph 4, the use of the XML Schema as defined by W3C. MS, however, doesn't teach blocking categories of information from presentation. Newlin teaches, in column 3, lines 47-65, multimedia devices connecting with a network via a Plug-and-Play interface, similar to that of MS, but further teaches in column 8, lines 2-14, a Parental Control limiting channel selection (blocking channels) for display on a

television. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS and Newlin before him at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Newlin to use Plug-and-Play as further defined by MS. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the Plug-and-Play and Universal-Plug-and-Play provide for easy set up and configuration of devices. MS and Newlin, however, don't teach blocking of categories of information where the categories are associated with at least one user-defined keyword input by a user. Ellis teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, and further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 54 and column 22, line 66 through column 23, line 8, blocking categories of information from display such as: items in a "Parental Guidance" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situations, and Parental Discretion; items in a "Rating" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.; and items in a "Program" category where a user can specify specific programs to be blocked. The "Parental Guidance" category, "MPAA Rating" category, and "Program" category each have associated user-defined keywords associated with them further defining a category. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, and Ellis before him at the time the invention was made to modify the Plug-and-Play TV system of MS and Newlin to further include the blocking of categories of information as did Ellis. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for remote blocking of categories either from a

parental guidance standpoint or for the cable company to block channels that aren't be paid for by a customer.

16. With regard to claims 29 and 43, which teach the available categories of information include the selected categories of information, Newlin further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, blocking categories of information for display from the group of all categories.

17. With regard to claim 33, MS teaches, on page 1, paragraphs 1-4 and page 11, paragraph 4, the use of Universal Plug and play for providing a user with a set of device descriptions and list of associated device services, which allow for selective retrieval of service descriptions, and allow for invoking the actions. MS teaches, on pages 28 and page 30, that the vendor only presents categories available, and where the user selects which category to be implemented, such as the clock set application that the user selects to implement, thereby transmitting only this category of information from the control point. MS further teaches, on page 16, paragraph 4, the use of the XML Schema as defined by W3C. MS, however, doesn't teach blocking categories of information from presentation. Newlin teaches, in column 3, lines 47-65, multimedia devices connecting with a network via a Plug-and-Play interface, similar to that of MS, but further teaches in column 8, lines 2-14, a Parental Control limiting channel selection (blocking channels) for display on a television. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS and Newlin before him at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Newlin to use Plug-and-Play as further defined by MS. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because

the Plug-and-Play and Universal-Plug-and-Play provide for easy set up and configuration of devices. MS and Newlin, however, don't teach blocking of categories of information where the categories are associated with at least one user-defined keyword input by a user. Ellis teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, and further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 54 and column 22, line 66 through column 23, line 8, blocking categories of information from display such as: items in a "Parental Guidance" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situations, and Parental Discretion; items in a "Rating" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.; and items in a "Program" category where a user can specify specific programs to be blocked. The "Parental Guidance" category, "MPAA Rating" category, and "Program" category each have associated user-defined keywords associated with them further defining a category. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, and Ellis before him at the time the invention was made to modify the Plug-and-Play TV system of MS and Newlin to further include the blocking of categories of information as did Ellis. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for remote blocking of categories either from a parental guidance standpoint or for the cable company to block channels that aren't be paid for by a customer.

18. With regard to claim 39, MS teaches, on page 1, paragraphs 1-4 and page 11, paragraph 4, the use of Universal Plug and Play for providing a user with a set of device

descriptions, each conveying its capabilities, and list of associated device services, which allow for selective retrieval of service descriptions, and allow for invoking the actions. MS teaches, on pages 28 and page 30, that the vendor only presents categories available, and where the user selects which category to be implemented, such as the clock set application that the user selects to implement, thereby transmitting only this category of information from the control point. MS further teaches, on page 16, paragraph 4, the use of the XML Schema as defined by W3C. MS, however, doesn't teach blocking categories of information from presentation. Newlin teaches, in column 3, lines 47-65, multimedia devices connecting with a network via a Plug-and-Play interface, similar to that of MS, but further teaches in column 8, lines 2-14, a Parental Control limiting channel selection (blocking channels) for display on a television. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS and Newlin before him at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Newlin to use Plug-and-Play as further defined by MS. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the Plug-and-Play and Universal-Plug-and-Play provide for easy set up and configuration of devices. MS and Newlin, however, don't teach categories of information where the categories are associated with at least one user-defined keyword keyed in by a user. Ellis teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, and further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 54 and column 22, line 66 through column 23, line 8, blocking categories of information from display such as: items in a "Parental Guidance" category including user specifiable keywords

representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situations, and Parental Discretion; items in a “Rating” category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.; and items in a “Program” category where a user can specify specific programs to be blocked. The “Parental Guidance” category, “MPAA Rating” category, and “Program” category each have associated user-defined keywords associated with them further defining a category. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, and Ellis before him at the time the invention was made to modify the Plug-and-Play TV system of MS and Newlin to further include the blocking of categories of information as did Ellis. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for remote blocking of categories either from a parental guidance standpoint or for the cable company to block channels that aren’t be paid for by a customer.

19. With regard to claims 47 and 48, which teach receiving user input at the information presentation appliance, MS further teaches, on page 30, paragraphs 1-5, the user clicking on a clock set application showing the use of an input device, from his laptop control point, and further on page 32, paragraph 3, the pressing of a mood control button, that effects several devices in the network.

20. Claims 12-14, 30-32, and 44-46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MS, Newlin, Ellis, and Dubal et al., Patent #6,711,630, hereinafter Dubal.

21. With regard to claims 12, 30, and 44, MS, Newlin, and Ellis teach the UPnP system using XML groupings as discussed above, but fail to disclose using pointers to access the service description information. Dubal teaches, in column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 11, a system for providing plug and play functionality in an audio and video system, similar to that of MS, Newlin, and Ellis, but further teaches the use of a pointer to the device object. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, Ellis, and Dubal, before him at the time the invention was made to modify UPnP of MS, Newlin, and Ellis, to include the functionality of a pointer system in accessing select categories of information. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because pointers, variables that contain memory locations, are an efficient means of accessing data.

22. With regard to claims 13, 31, and 45, MS, Newlin, and Ellis teach the UPnP system using XML groupings as discussed above, but fail to disclose using pointers to a list function to access the service description information. Dubal teaches, in column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 11, a system for providing plug and play functionality in an audio and video system, similar to that of MS, Newlin, and Ellis, but further teaches the use of a pointer to a list to the device object. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, Ellis, and Dubal, before him at the time the invention was made to modify UPnP of MS, Newlin, and Ellis, to include the functionality of a pointer system in accessing select categories of information. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because connecting nodes by pointers is an efficient means of accessing data.

23. With regard to claims 14, 32, and 46, MS, Newlin, and Ellis teach the UPnP system using XML groupings, that have associated names as discussed above, but fail to disclose using pointers to a list function to access the service description information. Dubal teaches, in column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 11, a system for providing plug and play functionality in an audio and video system, similar to that of MS, Newlin, and Ellis, but further teaches the use of a pointer to a list to the device object. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MS, Newlin, Ellis, and Dubal, before him at the time the invention was made to modify UPnP of MS, Newlin, and Ellis, to include the functionality of a pointer system in accessing select categories of information. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because connecting nodes by pointers (a linked list) is an efficient means of accessing data.

Response to Arguments

24. The arguments filed on 4-17-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.

25. The applicants argue that the categories of Ellis don't teach or suggest "user-defined keywords 'created' and entered by the user" associated with categories.

26. In response the examiner respectfully submits that Ellis teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 10, a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, and further teaches, in column 21, line 17 through column 22, line 54 and column 22, line 66 through column 23, line 8, blocking categories of information from

display such as: items in a "Parental Guidance" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situations, and Parental Discretion; items in a "Rating" category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.; and items in a "Program" category where a user can specify specific programs to be blocked. The "Parental Guidance" category, "MPAA Rating" category, and "Program" category each have associated user-defined keywords associated with them further defining a category.

Conclusion

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
28. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

29. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6-16-06
dgb



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173